

In re Application Serial Number 09/670, 154 to Gengying Gao et al.

The supervisor and examiner are thanked for the opportunity of presenting proposed arguments and claim changes in order to move the claims forward to allowance.

As requested, applicant has included a summary of the arguments and a proposed claim change in order to, more clearly, distinguish the present application from the cited art.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) over Paniccia.

It is respectfully submitted that Paniccia does not disclose testing ESD performance.

Paniccia specifically discusses the problems of debugging a new product (col. 1, lines 53-57). It then proposes a solution for determining voltage applied to a p-n junction by monitoring the electric field by monitoring the electro-absorption of a mode-locked laser (col. 7, lines 18-23).

Nowhere does Paniccia describe or suggest ways of monitoring ESD performance of an IC device. Claim 1, in contrast, specifically defines a method of monitoring ESD performance. This is not a feature proposed in arguments or only in the specification, but is specifically mentioned in claim 1.

However, in order to further distinguish the present invention from Paniccia, it is proposed amending claim 1 to include the step of "comparing the amount of reflected light to the amount of reflected light from an I/O cell having good ESD performance" (see page 4, lines 23-31). This step is clearly not present in Paniccia and is not suggested anywhere in Paniccia.

Since the remaining claims 2-20 depend from claim 1, they will include the new limitation, and are therefore also distinguishable over Paniccia.

Sincerely,  
Jurgen Vollrath